

Remarks

In the subject Action, the Examiner noted that claims 16-23 were withdrawn from further consideration, and Applicants hereby request that these claims be cancelled without prejudice.

Next, the Examiner rejected claims 4-9 and 10-15 as being anticipated by the cited patent to Miller. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and request reconsideration in view of the above amendments and the following reasons.

Applicants request that claim 4, from which claims 5-6 depend, be amended to emphasize that the second portions (of the left and right foot supports) are supported by respective rollers in a manner that defines respective rolling interfaces therebetween. This amendment is intended to distinguish Applicants' linkage arrangement over that disclosed in the cited Miller patent (because there are no rolling interfaces defined between the Miller foot supports and the Miller rollers). If the Examiner concludes that this amendment falls short of its objective, Applicants' undersigned representative would appreciate an opportunity to discuss alternative language with the Examiner on the telephone.

Applicants request that claim 7, from which claims 8-9 depend, be amended to recite that the left and right rollers are constrained to share a common axis of rotation. Applicants respectfully submit that no such arrangement is taught or suggested by the cited Miller patent (because the Miller rollers are mounted on separate rocker links).

Applicants request that claim 10, from which claims 11-15 depend, be amended to recite that the left and right rollers are

rotatably mounted on respective rocker links for rotation relative to respective rocker links and pivoting about the pivot axis; and further, that the second portions (of the left and right foot supporting members) are disposed on top of rotating bearing surfaces on respective rollers. Applicants respectfully submit that no such arrangement is taught or suggested by the cited Miller patent. Among other things, the Miller foot supports are not disposed on top of rotating bearing surfaces on respective rollers. Also, the Miller rollers are not rotatably mounted on respective rocker links for pivoting about the rocker link pivot axis. This latter observation is applicable to rejected claims 4-6 and 8-9, as well.

Finally, the Examiner noted that the original patent must be returned to the patent office before the reissue application can be allowed. Applicants will be prepared to submit the patent or an explanation for its absence in response to the next Action.

Having addressed the issues raised in the subject Action, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the claims, as amended. The Examiner is always welcome to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number set forth below to discuss any issue regarding the subject application.

Respectfully submitted,

MAK
Mark A. Krull
Reg. No. 34,205

(541) 385-0383